



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE **Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

**FILING DATE** SERIAL NUMBER FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. **BOFFITO** EXAMINER 08/278,129 07/21/94 CAPOSSELA,R ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 34M2/1011 DAVID R MURPHY 1003 JANNEYS LANE ALEXANDRIA VA 22302 10/11/94 This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on\_ This action is made final. days from the date of this letter. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ month(s), \_\_\_ Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: 1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. 4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION 1-14 AND 16-27 1. X Claims 2. Claims have been cancelled. are subject to restriction or election requirement. 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948). 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_ \_. has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation). 12-Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has Deen received Anot been received been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_ ; filed on \_\_\_

**EXAMINER'S ACTION** 

A THE STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE

13. Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in

accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

Serial Number: 08/278129 -2-

Art Unit: 3404

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims -3 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hagiwara et al in view of Matsch et al. Hagiwara et al shows the overall combination of a Dewar for storing a liquified gas. The space between outer tank 1 and inner tank 2 contains evacuted laminated insulation along with capsules 4 for containing either an absorbent or getter material. Absent therefrom is the concept of provide a material for absorbing hydrogen. Matsch et al teaches that it is old in the

Serial Number: 08/278129 -3-

Art Unit: 3404

prior art to provide an insulation material containing palladium oxide for removing hydrogen. Therefore to modify Hagiwara et al and provide such material taught by Matsch et al would have been obvious because both are from the same field of endeavor and especially because Hariwara et al suggests the need for a substance for hydrogen disposal.

Claims 4-14 and 16-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 25-27 stand allowed.

The references set forth on PTO 892 (which were present in the file but not discussed or cited by applicant) have been made of record.

1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to R. Capossela whose telephone number is (703) 308-0688.

R. CAPOSSELA: th October 11, 1994

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 344